

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE Northern District of Illinois – CM/ECF NextGen 1.8 (rev. 1.8.3)
Eastern Division**

Chicago Women in Trades

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No.: 1:25–cv–02005

Honorable Matthew F. Kennelly

Donald J. Trump, et al.

Defendant.

NOTIFICATION OF DOCKET ENTRY

This docket entry was made by the Clerk on Tuesday, July 15, 2025:

MINUTE entry before the Honorable Matthew F. Kennelly: Telephonic status and motion hearings held on 7/15/2025. (1) The Court construes defendants' motion for indicative ruling [119] as a motion for reconsideration in part of the preliminary injunction previously entered by the Court. Plaintiff's response to the motion is due 7/25/2025. (2) Plaintiff's response to defendants' motion to dismiss [114] is due 8/1/2025; defendants' reply is due 8/15/2025. (3) Defendants' motion to stay discovery [105] is denied. The motion was filed at the last minute—on the due date for defendants' discovery responses. In significant part it relies on the fact that defendants intended to move (and since have moved) to dismiss plaintiffs' complaint. But the pendency of a motion to dismiss is by itself not a basis to stay discovery. And in this case the motion to dismiss that defendants have filed largely relies on the proposition that the Court's earlier rulings (on the TRO and preliminary injunction) were wrong. Dismissal of the case in its entirety on the bases argued is unlikely for the reasons stated by the Court in its TRO and preliminary injunction rulings. Beyond that the motion to stay argues that the requested discovery is overly broad and unduly intrusive. But in this regard the motion paints with a very broad brush. And defendants have not (at least have not yet) objected to particular discovery requests on this basis. Rather their objections—which again were not made until the due date for their responses—simply cited the fact that they intended to move to stay discovery. Given the broad-brush approach to this issue in defendants' motion and the absence of particularized objections to discovery requests that would flesh out the generality of the motion the Court finds that the matter of a stay based on defendants' relevance and breadth objections is not ripe for a judicial decision at this point. To facilitate bringing the matter to a head the Court directs defendants to serve proper and particularized objections to plaintiffs' discovery requests by 7/29/2025. (4) Defendant's earlier motion to file an excess-page brief [113] is denied for the reasons previously stated. (5) The case is set for a telephonic status hearing on 8/6/2025 at 9:15 a.m. The following call-in number will be used for the hearing: 650–479–3207; access code 2305–915–8729. The Court notes that this is an earlier date than the one set during the telephonic hearing today. Persons granted remote access to proceedings are reminded of the general prohibition against photographing, recording, and rebroadcasting of court proceedings. Violation of these prohibitions may result in sanctions, including removal of court issued media credentials, restricted entry to future hearings, denial of entry to future

hearings, or any other sanctions deemed necessary by the Court. Mailed notice. (mma,)

ATTENTION: This notice is being sent pursuant to Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or Rule 49(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. It was generated by CM/ECF, the automated docketing system used to maintain the civil and criminal dockets of this District. If a minute order or other document is enclosed, please refer to it for additional information.

For scheduled events, motion practices, recent opinions and other information, visit our web site at www.ilnd.uscourts.gov.